

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1374, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 680 U.S. Highway 130 in Hamilton, New Jersey, as the 'John K. Rafferty Hamilton Post Office Building.'"

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be granted 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1374, bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE URGING 95 PERCENT OF FEDERAL EDUCATION DOLLARS BE SPENT IN THE CLASSROOM

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 303) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives urging that 95 percent of Federal education dollars be spent in the classroom, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 303

Whereas effective teaching begins by helping children master basic academics, holding children to high standards, using effective, scientifically based methods of instruction in the classroom, engaging and involving parents, creating safe and orderly classrooms, and getting dollars to the classroom;

Whereas our Nation's children deserve an educational system that provides opportunities to excel;

Whereas States and localities must spend a significant amount of education tax dollars applying for and administering Federal education dollars;

Whereas the administrative costs of the United States are twice the average of other countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD);

Whereas it is unknown exactly what percentage of Federal education dollars reaches the classroom, but according to the Department of Education, in 1998, 84 percent of the Department's elementary and secondary education dollars were allocated to local educational agencies and used for instruction and instructional support;

Whereas the remainder of the Department's dollars was allocated to States, universities, national programs, and other service providers;

Whereas the total spent by the Department for elementary and secondary education does not take into account what States must

spend to receive Federal dollars and comply with requirements, it also does not reflect what portion of the Federal dollars allocated to school districts is spent on students in the classroom;

Whereas American students are not performing up to their full academic potential, despite significant Federal education initiatives, which span multiple Federal agencies;

Whereas according to the Digest of Education Statistics, during the 1995-96 school year only 54 percent of \$278,965,657,000 spent on elementary and secondary education was spent on "instruction";

Whereas according to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 1996, only 52 percent of staff employed in public elementary and secondary school systems were teachers;

Whereas according to the latest data available from the General Accounting Office, in fiscal year 1993, Federal education dollars funded 13,397 full-time equivalent positions in State educational agencies;

Whereas in fiscal year 1998, the Department of Education's paperwork and data reporting requirements totaled 40,000,000 "burden hours," which is the equivalent of 19,300 people working 40 hours a week for 1 full year;

Whereas too much of our Federal education funding is spent on bureaucracy, special interests, and ineffective programs, and too little is effectively spent on our Nation's youth;

Whereas getting 95 percent of all Federal elementary and secondary education funds to the classroom could provide substantial additional funding per classroom across the United States;

Whereas more education funding should be put in the hands of someone in a child's classroom who knows the child's name;

Whereas burdensome regulations, requirements, and mandates should be removed so that school districts can devote more resources to children in classrooms; and

Whereas President Clinton has stated: "We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we've got now." Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives urges the Department of Education, States, and local educational agencies to work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of Education is spent to improve the academic achievement of our children in their classrooms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I believe it is important that we go about the work of reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and also appropriating funds for education, that Congress renews its commitment to the principle that education dollars are most effectively spent in the classroom.

Two years ago the Dollars to the Classroom resolution was overwhelmingly supported by this chamber by a vote of 310 to 99. This resolution is a resolution that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) has been tremendously influential in bringing be-

fore our committee and then to the floor of the House. It is difficult for me to think of what could be more non-controversial than Congress recognizing the importance of sending dollars directly to the classroom. We want to make sure every tax dollar we spend on education makes a real difference in the life of a child.

Specifically, the Dollars to the Classroom resolution calls on the U.S. Department of Education to work with States and local school districts to ensure that 95 percent of funds for elementary and secondary education are spent to improve the academic achievement of our children in their classrooms. The United States spends twice as much; I repeat, the United States spends twice as much as any other country to administer education.

Too much is spent on bureaucracy at all levels of government. We need to do our part to make sure that Federal dollars do not enable bureaucracies at State and local levels to grow even larger. We know very little about what proportion of Federal dollars are spent in the classroom. The Department of Education says 84 percent. Others say even less. But we do not need to argue about the exact number.

The evidence of bureaucracy taking away resources from the classrooms are plentiful. For example, more than 13,000 employees are funded with Federal dollars and State education agencies to administer Federal programs. It would take 20,000 full-time employees a year to fill out all of the paperwork produced by the Department of Education. In just the Elementary and Secondary Education Act there are more than 60 programs. Overall there are more than 760 education programs.

I think we can all agree that Congress should be about the business of empowering parents and teachers to do their jobs as effectively as possible, and that means giving them the resources to educate children as effectively as possible. It is time to transform the Federal rule to make it student centered, not program centered, to make it results centered rather than process centered. At the end of the day what is more important is how these programs are working to improve student achievement. We want to make sure that every tax dollar counts and goes to helping children learn. We think this is best accomplished by moving resources to the people who do help children learn, parents and classroom teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us agree that it is important to send the vast majority of education dollars to the classroom. In fact, that is exactly what the Federal Government is doing right now according to the new report by the GAO. On September 30, GAO released an analysis of the top 10 education programs

and found that the Department of Education distributed over 99 percent of the money to the States.

The States, in turn, distributed an average of 94 percent of the funds they received to local school districts. Far from the bureaucratic nightmare of wasted Federal dollars repeatedly alleged by some in the Republican majority, GAO found that States used their funds on providing technical assistance to local educational agencies, to professional development for teachers, to program evaluation and to curricula development.

Mr. Speaker, GAO also surveyed local school administrators in nine representative school districts and made the following emphatic conclusion, and I quote: "We found that State staffs spent very little time administering the programs and that district office staff also generally spent little time administering them," end of quote.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite ironic that this GAO study was not requested by Democrats, but by the majority, Republican majority. Now I suspect that some of those who requested this study were hoping that it would be a hit job on the Department of Education. Instead, it confirms what we have said all along. The Department of Education spends less than 1 percent of funds on administration.

So I hope that this new GAO report will stop those who would falsely demagogue the administration of the Department of Education programs. We want solutions, not false and empty resolutions. The majority's funding plan for education is in shambles. We should get on with finishing the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act instead of wasting time on this blatant effort to undermine public support for Federal education spending.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), who has worked so hard that this money does get down, in spite of what we just heard, to the classroom teacher.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for his leadership and support on behalf of this resolution and all education reform. I just want to mention first of all, in response to the gentleman from Missouri who cited a GAO report, that he did not continue reading from the report. I have a copy of it here. Let me continue reading what he failed to read:

"After saying that collectively the States distributed 94 percent of the Federal funds they received mainly to local agencies," it continues, "excluding the \$7.3 billion Title I program, one of the largest elementary secondary education programs. The overall percentage of funds States allocated to local agencies by the remaining 9 programs was 86 percent."

I could read more, but that is the quote used in the resolution.

Also he mentioned the local administrators not complaining. Let me give my colleagues a quote from my school superintendent when he came to present testimony before the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He said, "The direct funding of dollars for classroom teachers' use would put the money in the hands of the people who would make the difference in districts like ours. Who better to decide what is needed in his or her classroom than the teacher."

Another one Dr. Linder Shingo, a superintendent from Georgia: "Administrators from Washington will never meet the needs of individual children. I cast my vote for returning as many dollars directly to the local schools as we are able. Less bureaucracy on all levels would allow more dollars to directly reach the students in the classroom."

In addition, one of the administrators said they do not even bother applying for the Federal funds because of the administrative requirements and the costs to them in the local level and the paperwork and the procedure necessary to apply for the Federal funds.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me go ahead and say that I rise in support, strong support, of the Dollars to the Classroom resolution today, an effort on which we have been working for a couple of years to ensure that our Federal elementary and secondary education dollars get to where they belong, in the classroom of our public schools where teachers who know a child's name has some control over the money.

Overall not a lot, a high percentage of our schools' funding is from the Federal Government. Most of it is State and local government funds, but about 6 to 7 percent does come from the Federal Government, and this is about in a day of tightening tax dollars the need for more efficient and effective use of our tax dollars. Currently, as I mentioned, it is estimated and depending on the programs some more some less, but it is estimated from between 65 to 86 percent of the Federal education dollars make it to the classroom for educational purposes.

Regardless of the exact amount, that is not enough. It is no secret that funds designated for the education of our kids are wasted when they are not funneled down to the level where they can actually play a supportive role in classroom activities, and instead they are often funneled off by bureaucracies at all levels. The importance of this Dollars to the Classroom resolution today is that we should set a standard to reduce bureaucratic and ineffective spending. We should work to get more money into the local classroom. We should prioritize the way we spend our education tax dollars and put children first.

This is about the kids. This is for them. We must get the dollars down to where they benefit, where the action is,

into the classroom, and our kids deserve to be the prime beneficiaries of Federal funding. This resolution calls on Federal, State, and local agencies to ensure that 95 percent of the funds are used for classroom activities and services.

What could this mean for our kids? First, it would signal an important systemic shift in how Federal education dollars can be delivered to our Nation's schools. It could mean more books, more textbooks. I have had students from my district share that their textbooks are in some cases older than their teachers. In the words of an eighth grader who was here last year and who spoke, he said quote, "Our geography books are from the 1980s. A lot has happened in the world since then. Instead of calling the books Geography Today, they should be called Geography of the World 15 years ago," end quote.

□ 1615

That is a pretty astute comment for an eighth grader. More dollars to the classroom could also mean more teachers, more teacher aides. This money could be used for teachers' salaries. More dollars to the classroom could mean new computers, computer software, even microscopes so that students have new opportunities of discovery in science and physics and mathematics.

It is a little-known fact that most public schoolteachers now dip into their own pockets to provide supplies for their classrooms, sometimes spending hundreds and even thousands of dollars a year. Yet, consider this fact: according to the General Accounting Office study in fiscal year 1993, Federal education dollars funded 13,397 full-time equivalent positions in State education agencies. In fiscal year 1998, the Department of Education's paperwork and data reporting requirements totaled 40 million of what they call burden hours, which is the equivalent of 19,300 people working 40 hours a week for one full year.

If we are honestly going to discuss our priorities in Federal funding of elementary and secondary education, we must ask why so much funding goes to the bureaucracy instead of going right to the kids in the classroom. With the dollars to the classroom resolution, we aim to put priority back on our kids. This is a goal on which we all can agree. We should vote for the Dollars to the Classroom resolution, recognizing that local schools, not bureaucracies, are best suited to make decisions about allocating resources. They understand their students' backgrounds, their needs; they can respond to them most directly with proven methods of instructions. We should trust the parents and our teachers and our public schools to use money to meet their unique needs. Vote for the dollars to the classroom resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to understand why the gentleman would exclude Title I from factoring in the administrative costs when it is the largest education program in the country, \$8 billion. And when we factor in the ESEA to Title I funding, my figures are correct. Ninety-nine percent of the Federal money goes to the States, and 94 percent of that goes to the classroom.

The problem the gentleman from Pennsylvania has is with his State agency. IDEA, when we send Federal money to the State, the State keeps 25 percent of it instead of sending it on to the LEAs or the local LEAs or to the classroom. When the national average for that money is 13.5 percent, what is the State of Pennsylvania doing with the other 13.5 percent, the other 12.5 percent? That is where his problem is, and that is where he ought to be trying to get the State legislature to do something about that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

(Mr. MARTINEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY). The problem is not here in the Federal Government because the Federal Government does send most of the money to the local States and school districts, it is the local States' and school districts' options to do with that money what they will. In fact, there is a contradiction here. They are saying 95 percent goes to the classroom when in fact, more than 95 percent goes to the classroom already, 99 percent goes. The fact is, with this resolution one would think we are opting to give the locals the discretion to use more than the 1 percent they are using now for administration and use the 5 percent for administration, so in actuality, the resolution is counteracting what they are professing to do.

But more than that, the gentleman referred to the GAO study and the GAO study, in actually looking at the schools, it says, in the context of the government as it prepares to consider the reauthorization, and they asked to determine how the educational programs and the administration money was used for, and the final thing it says, we selected nine school districts to ensure that the districts were of varying sizes, were located in different parts of the country, and represented a mix of urban, suburban, and rural districts; and their conclusion was, in visiting the nine schools of the Nation's 16,000 school districts, they found that the school level staff spent very little time administering the programs and their district office staff, which also generally spent very little time administering the programs.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to be here on the floor wrangling about something that

gives somebody a 30-second political soundbite that they can use in some way to enhance themselves in saying this is what we do for education. I rise in opposition to this resolution because it is a nonbinding resolution to begin with, and although it urges the Department of Education, the Federal Department of Education, the States and local educational agencies to strive to ensure that 95 percent of all Federal funds appropriated for educational programs are spent to improve academic achievement in the classroom, let me tell my colleagues that in those local school districts where the bulk of the money comes from, they are doing exactly that. They are trying to spend that money in a way that they can guarantee the academic achievement in the classroom of these young children, contrary to what my friends on the other side of the aisle say.

While it is a nice sentiment, I must express my dismay that we are wasting time on the floor on this resolution when we could be doing so many other things that are more important such as providing monies for classroom construction in the local schools, something that we have been refusing to do which would go a long way in helping these kids achieve academic fulfillment. We are about 2 weeks into the fiscal year, and we only have about nine of the 13 annual appropriations bills, including the educational appropriations bill, still outstanding.

If the Republicans call for the Federal Government to shut down next week, no Federal money will be going to those classrooms where they want 95 percent to go. In addition, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) pointed out, according to a recent study that they ordered by GAO that was done at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), 95 percent of all of the Federal education dollars are already being spent on improving that academic achievement.

So here we are today, wasting time on a resolution that does not do anything because it is nonbinding, urging the Department and the States and the districts to do something that they have already been doing for a good number of years. We in the Congress have a tendency to contradict and let us say over and over again to the public school districts that they are not doing what they should be doing in educating their children. There may be public school districts in some places that need a lot of improvement. But the fact of the matter is, 95 percent of all of the people that sit in this chamber and 95 percent of all of our staff are products of the public schools. If the public schools are so bad, then how did we all get here. I say we ought to let the locals do as they know best as they say so many times and take our nose out of their business.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I guess I should ask to have my statement brought back to me, because I cut out all that nonsense political partisanship that was written into it, but maybe after hearing all of this nonsense, I should bring it back and read that too. Obviously, some people have not read the resolution, because the resolution very specifically says that the Federal Secretary should work with State and local officials to bring this about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), and I ask unanimous consent that he control our time from this point on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and applaud the chairman for the work that over the years he has done on education. I also thank the chairman for the opportunity that he provided me over the last couple of years to take our subcommittee around the country and hold a series of hearings that we entitled education at a crossroads.

As we went around the country, as we heard from governors, as we heard from local officials, we did hear about the Federal money that goes to the local level, that goes to the State level. We consistently heard about the money that comes to the local level, the money that goes to the State level and how Federal strings are tied to that money. Not necessarily consuming dollars in Washington, but consuming lots of dollars at the State and local level, either in applying for the programs, finding out what programs existed, or meeting the reporting requirements of the various education programs.

So the requests from the States, the requests from the local agencies and the local departments of education was, send us the money, free us from the mandates, free us from the paperwork, give us a system that allows us to focus on educating our kids, free us up so that we can focus on meeting the educational needs of our local communities and our local schools. And that, in the bigger sense, is what dollars to the classroom is about. It is saying that number one, we want to target Federal education dollars to the States and to the local levels, eliminating bureaucracy.

But the larger component of dollars to the classroom encourages the Secretary to take a look at the total picture of the costs that we are imposing on States and local agencies where we are not spending Federal dollars, but where we are spending local and State dollars to meet Federal requirements. We need to endorse the direction of this approach; this is a good proposal, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. If this was a debate about military policy, this would be like us ignoring the People's Republic of China and declaring war on the British Virgin Islands.

We are here today to discuss a problem that has largely been solved; at the same time, we are ignoring some very real problems in America's classrooms.

The chairman of the committee and the distinguished subcommittee chairman wrote to the General Accounting Office who calls them as they see them. And they said, we have heard all of these concerns that too many dollars are being kept in Washington and spent by the Washington bureaucrats and not getting back to the classroom. Tell us what the facts are. And the GAO did a study of it and the GAO came to this conclusion: in fiscal year 1996, the Department of Education distributed over 99 percent of its appropriations for the 10 programs to the States, the States in turn collectively distributed 94 percent of that money to the local districts.

Then we hear that, well, all the money is really being spent by the local districts in filling out papers and complying with all of these rules. The GAO sent investigators to nine school districts, they did in-depth evaluation and discussion with the personnel in those districts and here is what they concluded: this is not the Democratic Party concluding this or the Republican Party concluding this, this is the GAO, which I think has, as their motto is on the front page, a reputation for dependability and integrity, and here is what they said: we found that school level staff spent very little time administering the programs and the district office staff also generally spend little time administering them.

So it seems to me that we are here discussing, in large part, a problem that exists only in the minds of the majority. Title I, less than 1 percent of the funds spent in Washington. IDEA, less than 1 percent of the funds spent in Washington. The Perkins loan program, nothing spent in Washington. Safe and drug-free schools which the majority tried to eliminate a few years ago, less than 1 percent spent in Washington. Goals 2000, that terrible Federal takeover of our schools that they resisted so violently, less than 1 percent spent in Washington. The school-to-work program, maybe we should take a look at this, 7 percent spent in Washington, 93 in the States; the Eisenhower program, less than 1 percent spent in Washington. Innovative education, nothing spent in Washington, bilingual education, 1 percent; Even Start, 1 percent.

Now, I say to my colleagues, there are some real problems that we ought

to be discussing. In my State of New Jersey, children today in over 50 schools went to schools that are more than 100 years old. Children went to 1,000 that were more than 50 years old that are falling apart, yet the majority has not seen fit to bring a school construction bill to this floor. My colleagues may disagree in the majority with school construction, but, Mr. Speaker, let us bring it to the floor and have an honest debate and a vote.

□ 1630

We are discussing the issue of class size reduction. There are children going to kindergarten, first and second grade, in schools with 36 and 37 children. They can learn successfully, but every valid piece of educational research we know says that children tend to do better when they are in with 17 or 18 children in the primary grades. Bring to the floor legislation that will fund, not just talk about but fund, a class size reduction.

The majority's Committee on Appropriations is apparently about to propose an across-the-board cut in the Labor-HHS appropriation bills that will cut across-the-board Title I, IDEA, Perkins, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Goals 2000, School-to-Work, Eisenhower, Innovative Education, bilingual, Even Start, and all the rest. So they want 95 percent of a smaller number, I would guess.

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-intentioned amendment, but it talks about a problem that largely has already been solved. I would suggest that we get to work solving one that really exists. Let us put our workers to work in this country building and repairing schools, let us put qualified teachers in every classroom, and let us put ourselves to work on the real issues of education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I am real curious about the facts and statistics that we just heard, because I have been in about 20 schools over the last couple of months, and what I have heard does not bear up to teachers who even yesterday were telling me that they were spending so much of their time dealing with paperwork.

In Ohio, it is estimated that 50 percent of the paperwork burden was generated by Federal education programs, though the Federal resources provided only 5 percent of the funding. In Arizona, Lisa Graham Keegan, the State superintendent for public construction, says that while the Federal programs only account for 6 percent of the education spending in the State, 45 percent of the staff in the State Department of Education work with or manage Federal programs.

I was in a dilapidated school yesterday that would like to renovate, but they cannot because of Federal regs. If they touch one bit of that building, they have to bring the whole building

into compliance with ADA, which means it is cheaper to tear it down and build another one than it is to renovate to make it a better building.

The things we do here in Washington, while well-intended, have a stranglehold on our schools. A special education student that is profoundly affected still has an education plan that is six pounds that a teacher has to use. There are only two pages they actually use for that student, but there are six pounds to cover themselves from lawsuits that come from the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 303, which urges that 95 cents of every Federal education dollar be spent in the classroom. I am a cosponsor of this important resolution because I believe it sets forth the vision that many of us have for education in this country, a vision in America where all children are achieving their fullest potential because they are taught by well-trained teachers in disciplined classrooms filled with educational resources.

Our children's education is most secure when the dollars and decisions are controlled back home by parents and teachers and local school districts. Spending 95 cents of every Federal dollar in the classroom is a worthy and attainable goal to improve education in our country. Our students deserve to have the money that we are setting aside for them actually work for them in the classroom.

The statistics that we hear here by whatever government agency are a far cry from what teachers and principals and people are telling us back home. Let us take our hands off it and let the system work. Let teachers teach and principals take care of their schools.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am still having trouble understanding this non-debate about this non-educational issue. The very people who requested the GAO to study the problem and the allegations they are making claim that they do not like what they hear. Well, they asked this independent body to report, to study and report. Now, when the body reports back, they say they do not believe it or they do not like it or they do not understand it.

I do not understand what this issue is about. We know that the vast majority of funds from the Federal and State level go into the classroom. I think it is a political issue that they have hyped up and it is backfiring on them, because all credible evidence shows that the money is going into the classroom, so it is a non-issue. This is a non-debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Pitts), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is never a waste of time to talk

about the money spent on our kids, educating our kids in the classroom.

As far as the statistics, reading from the gentleman's own report, he says that 99 percent, and I will read the same sentence, it does not say "to the classroom," it says, "distributed over 99 percent of the appropriations from the 10 programs to the States." It does not say "to the classrooms."

Now, if we read down lower on that page, page 3, it says if we exclude Title I, which is the most efficient program, and look at the other nine, we have an average of 86 percent in those nine programs. So from the gentleman's own report, and if the gentleman will look on page 10, it graphs each one as far as what is the administrative cost of the States, the States' use. If we just disregard the Federal use and look at the State agencies on page 10, only two programs meet the 5 percent or below. All the rest are above. That is just what the State administrative costs are, not the local administrative costs.

Our resolution states, "The local education agencies should work together to ensure that not less than 95 percent of all funds appropriated for the purpose of carrying out elementary and secondary education programs administered by the Department of education is spent to improve the academic achievement of our children in their classroom."

So what we are talking about is what is really important here. That is the kids in the classroom. That is what this resolution is all about, how are we going to impact the kids' learning and give the equipment, the tools to the teachers that directly impact the children, give them the aid that directly impacts their teaching so our kids can compete in this world. That is the goal of this resolution. I urge the Members to adopt it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To close the debate, the direction that we are establishing for Federal involvement for education is that we want to move towards safe and drug-free schools. We want local schools that focus on basic academics. We want local control, and we want to drive dollars back to the classroom. That is where we believe and that is where we know we have the most leverage on improving our kids' education.

This resolution states that. It says that as a Federal Government, we are committed to moving Federal dollars back to the local level, where we can have the most impact. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. WOOSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are supporting legislation to tell local communities how they should spend their education dollars.

Education in America has always been a local issue and I, for one, think it should stay local.

In the communities which I represent in Congress, Communities in Marin and Sonoma County, California, the decisions on how to

use education funds are made by locally elected school boards, with input from parents, educators and students.

They don't need Washington, DC telling them where to spend their money!

Every community in my district already spends the majority of its education funds in the classroom.

But, sometimes a community needs to spend funds in other ways, such as teacher training activities, educational technology or coordinated services.

No matter how much money we spend in the classroom, children must come to school ready to learn; teachers need to advance their skills; and students should have the benefit of modern educational technology.

We have always relied on parents, educators and local community leaders to make local education decisions. I urge my colleagues to show their trust in the folks back home by voting against H. Res. 303.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 303, a resolution which urges that 95 cents of every federal education dollar be sent back to where they belong—in the hands of parents and teachers. The Dollars to the Classroom Resolution, H. Res. 303, calls on education agencies at all levels to ensure that 95 percent of federal spending for elementary and secondary education programs makes it into the classrooms of this country.

The Dollars to the Classroom Resolution recognizes the fact that learning takes place in a classroom, and thus student-focused expenditures on direct learning tools, such as books, computers, maps, and microscopes, should be prioritized. H. Res. 303 calls on education agencies to work together to ensure that federal elementary and secondary appropriations are put to use on instructional purposes for youth in classrooms. We must make a commitment to send more education dollars to schools, libraries, teachers, and students—not administrators and federal bureaucrats. The Dollars to the Classroom Resolution will require that 95 percent of federal education funds be used for classroom activities and services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give teachers and parents the final authority over how education dollars are spent—not the federal government—and support H. Res. 303.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 303, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 303.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FATHER THEODORE M. HESBURGH CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1932) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to civil rights, higher education, the Catholic Church, the Nation, and the global community.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1932

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Father Theodore M. Hesburgh Congressional Gold Medal Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., has made outstanding and enduring contributions to American society through his activities in civil rights, higher education, the Catholic Church, the Nation, and the global community;

(2) Father Hesburgh was a charter member of the United States Commission on Civil Rights from its creation in 1957 and served as chairperson of the Commission from 1969 to 1972;

(3) Father Hesburgh was president of the University of Notre Dame from 1952 until 1987, and has been president emeritus since 1987;

(4) Father Hesburgh is a national and international leader in higher education;

(5) Father Hesburgh has been honored with the Elizabeth Ann Seton Award from the National Catholic Education Association and with more than 130 honorary degrees;

(6) Father Hesburgh served as co-chairperson of the nationally influential Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and as chairperson, from 1994 to 1996, of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University;

(7) Father Hesburgh served under President Ford as a member of the Presidential Clemency Board, charged with deciding the fates of persons committing offenses during the Vietnam conflict;

(8) Father Hesburgh served as chairman of the board of the Overseas Development Council and in that capacity led fundraising efforts that averted mass starvation in Cambodia in 1979 and 1980;

(9) Father Hesburgh served from 1979 to 1981 as chairperson of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, which made recommendations that served as the basis of congressional reform legislation enacted 5 years later;

(10) Father Hesburgh served as ambassador to the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development; and

(11) Father Hesburgh has served the Catholic Church in a variety of capacities, including his service from 1956 to 1970 as the permanent Vatican representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna and his service as a member of the Holy See's delegation to the United Nations.